

James E. Doroshow (SBN 112920)  
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP  
Constellation Place  
10250 Constellation Blvd., Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 228-6990  
Facsimile: (310) 556-9828  
Email: JDoroshow@FoxRothschild.com

Attorneys for Defendant  
NORDICA SAUNA, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION**

NORDIC SAUNA, LLC, a  
California Limited Liability  
Company

,

Plaintiff,

v.

NORDICA SAUNA, LLC, a Wyoming  
Limited Liability Company, CHRIS  
TESTER, an individual; and DOES 1-10,  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-05713

Judge: Hon. John A. Kronstadt

**NORDICA SAUNA, LLC'S  
ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

**[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]**

Complaint Filed: June 23, 2025

1 Defendant Nordica Sauna, LLC (“Nordica”), by and through its undersigned counsel  
2 for itself alone, hereby answers the Complaint of Plaintiff Nordic Sauna, LLC (“Nordic  
3 Sauna” or “Plaintiff”) as follows. Except as expressly alleged, averred, or admitted,  
4 Nordica denies each and every allegation of the Complaint<sup>1</sup>.

5 **ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO THE PARTIES**

6 1. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
7 allegations contained in Paragraph 1. Accordingly, these allegations are denied.

8 2. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it is a limited liability company  
9 organized and existing under the laws of the State of Wyoming. Nordica further admits that  
10 it has a registered agent address at 30 N. Gould St Ste R., Sheridan, Wyoming, 82801.  
11 Nordica denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 2.

12 3. Denied.

13 4. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that Nordica conducts business in California.  
14 Nordica denies all remaining allegations in Paragraph 4, including that it sells any infringing  
15 goods in Los Angeles, California.

16 5. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
17 allegations contained in Paragraph 5. Accordingly, these allegations are denied.

18 6. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
19 allegations contained in Paragraph 6. Accordingly, these allegations are denied.

20 **ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21 7. The allegations contained in Paragraph 7 set forth legal conclusions to which  
22 no response is required. To the extent necessary, Nordica admits that federal courts  
23 generally have subject-matter jurisdiction over claims for trademark infringement in the  
24 United States relating to United States trademark claims and registrations.

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Nordica does not respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint on behalf of any other party because,  
27 from Nordica’s understanding and as reflected on the Docket, no other individual or entity  
28 has yet been served in this litigation and are therefore are not yet parties to the case. All  
answers and denials are on behalf of Nordica Sauna, LLC alone at this time.



1 16. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it owns the domain name  
2 <https://nordicasauna.com>. Nordica further admits that it operates its business through  
3 <https://nordicasauna.com>. Nordica denies the remaining allegation contained in Paragraph  
4 16, including by denying any characterization of Nordica’s business particularly since  
5 Nordica does not manufacture or sell any “Nordica Sauna” branded products.

6 17. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that [https://nordicasauna.com/pages/about-](https://nordicasauna.com/pages/about-us)  
7 [us](https://nordicasauna.com/pages/about-us) is the “About Us” page on its website. Nordica further admits that it uses the phrase  
8 NORDICA SAUNA in connection with its business. Nordica denies all remaining  
9 allegations in Paragraph 17, including denying that it uses the phrase “Nordic Sauna” as a  
10 trademark, but instead, any use of the phrase “Nordic Sauna” was either an inadvertent  
11 typographical error that has since been corrected or a merely descriptive use of the term to  
12 refer to a specific type of sauna.

13 18. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
14 allegations contained in Paragraph 18. Accordingly, these allegations are denied, and  
15 Nordica specifically denies that Nordica’s use of the phrase “Nordica Sauna” infringes on  
16 any of Plaintiff’s alleged trademark rights or creates a likelihood of confusion.

17 19. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
18 allegations contained in Paragraph 19. Accordingly, these allegations are denied.

19 20. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
20 allegations contained in Paragraph 20. Accordingly, these allegations are denied, and  
21 Nordica specifically denies that any of its actions have caused any actual or potential  
22 confusion among consumers.

23 21. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
24 allegations contained in Paragraph 21. Accordingly, these allegations are denied, and  
25 Nordica specifically denies that any single instance demonstrates any alleged actual or  
26 potential confusion between Nordica and Plaintiff.

27 22. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
28 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica

1 denies the allegations of Paragraph 22, and Nordica specifically denies that any single  
2 instance demonstrates any alleged actual or potential confusion between Nordica and  
3 Plaintiff.

4 23. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
5 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
6 denies the allegations of Paragraph 23, and Nordica specifically denies that any single  
7 instance demonstrates any alleged actual or potential confusion between Nordica and  
8 Plaintiff and Nordica further denies that it manufactures or sells any “competitor’s product”  
9 since Nordica does not manufacture or sell Nordica branded products.

10 24. The allegations contained in Paragraph 24 state legal arguments or conclusions  
11 to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica denies the  
12 allegations of Paragraph 24, and Nordica specifically denies that any single instance  
13 demonstrates any alleged actual or potential confusion between Nordica and Plaintiff.

14 25. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
15 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
16 denies the allegations of Paragraph 25, and Nordica specifically denies that any single  
17 instance demonstrates any alleged actual or potential confusion between Nordica and  
18 Plaintiff.

19 **DEFENDANT’S ALLEGEDLY FRAUDULENT TRADEMARK FILING**

20 26. Nordica admits that it filed a trademark application with the United States  
21 Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) for the stylized wordmark, **nordica**. Nordica  
22 lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations  
23 contained in Paragraph 26. Accordingly, these allegations are denied.

24 27. Nordica admits that an Opposition Proceeding was filed by Plaintiff against its  
25 trademark application on April 18, 2025. Nordica lacks information sufficient to form a  
26 belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 27. Accordingly,  
27 these allegations are denied.

28 28. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it withdrew its trademark application.

1 The order entered by the Board is a public record and speaks for itself. Nordica therefore  
2 denies any characterization by Plaintiff of said order and the related proceedings before the  
3 Board, and as such, denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 28.

4 29. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it legally uses its website and the phrase  
5 “Nordica Sauna” in connection with the resale of third-party goods. Nordica denies the  
6 remaining allegations of Paragraph 29, and Nordica specifically denies that any use of the  
7 phrase “Nordica Sauna” infringes any alleged trademark rights of Plaintiff or creates any  
8 actual or likelihood of confusion.

9 30. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
10 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
11 denies the allegations of Paragraph 30 and specifically denies that the alleged Nordic Sauna  
12 Marks are, or have ever been, distinctive.

13 31. Denied.

14 32. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
15 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
16 denies the allegations of Paragraph 32, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
17 conduct has caused any harm to Plaintiff or created actual or a likelihood of confusion.

18 **Alleged Harm to Nordic Sauna**

19 33. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
20 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
21 denies the allegations of Paragraph 33, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
22 conduct has caused, or will cause, any harm to Plaintiff, including creating any actual or  
23 likelihood of confusion or deception.

24 **FIRST CLAIM**

25 **Alleged Trademark Infringement – 15 U.S.C. § 1114**

26 34. Nordica repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs 1-33 as if fully set forth  
27 herein.

28 35. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or

1 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
2 denies the allegations of Paragraph 35 and specifically denies that Plaintiff currently has a  
3 valid or enforceable trademark or more than one federally registered trademark.

4 36. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
5 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
6 denies the allegations of Paragraph 36.

7 37. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
8 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
9 denies the allegations of Paragraph 37.

10 38. Denied.

11 39. Denied.

12 40. Denied.

13 41. Denied.

14 42. Denied.

15 43. Denied.

16 44. Denied.

17 45. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
18 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
19 denies the allegations of Paragraph 45, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
20 conduct has caused, or will cause, any harm to Plaintiff.

21 46. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
22 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
23 denies the allegations of Paragraph 46, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
24 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage to Plaintiff.

25 47. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
26 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
27 denies the allegations of Paragraph 47, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
28 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage to Plaintiff.

1 48. Denied.

2 **SECOND CLAIM**

3 **Alleged Unfair Competition, False Association, and False Designation of Origin**  
4 **– 15 U.S.C. § 1125**

5 49. Nordica repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs 1-48 as if fully set forth  
6 herein.

7 50. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
8 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
9 denies the allegations of Paragraph 50.

10 51. Denied.

11 52. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
12 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
13 denies the allegations of Paragraph 52.

14 53. Denied.

15 54. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
16 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
17 denies the allegations of Paragraph 54, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
18 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage to Plaintiff.

19 55. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
20 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
21 denies the allegations of Paragraph 55, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
22 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage to Plaintiff.

23 56. Denied.

24 **THIRD COUNTERCLAIM [sic]**

25 **Alleged Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act – 15 U.S.C. § 1125**

26 57. Nordica repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs 1-56 as if fully set forth  
27 herein.

28 58. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it owns the domain name



1 NORDICASAUNA.COM and operates its business through that website. Nordica denies  
2 the remaining allegations of Paragraph 58.

3 59. Denied as stated. Nordica admits that it first registered the domain name  
4 NORDICASAUNA.COM on November 10, 2022. The remaining allegations contained in  
5 this paragraph state legal arguments or conclusions to which no response is required. To  
6 the extent a response is required, Nordica denies the allegations of Paragraph 59.

7 60. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal argument or conclusions  
8 to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica denies the  
9 allegations of Paragraph 60.

10 61. Denied.

11 62. Denied.

12 63. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
13 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
14 denies the allegations of Paragraph 63.

15 64. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
16 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a responsive pleading is  
17 required, Nordica denies the allegations of Paragraph 64, and Nordica specifically denies  
18 that any of its conduct has caused, or will cause, any injury to Plaintiff.

19 **FOURTH COUNTERCLAIM [sic]**

20 **Alleged California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq**

21 65. Nordica repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs as if set forth herein.

22 66. Denied. Nordica denies that it had a duty to seek Plaintiff's consent for the  
23 lawful use by it of the "NORDICA" term or any other term. Nordica denies all remaining  
24 allegations in this paragraph.

25 67. Denied.

26 68. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
27 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
28 denies the allegations of Paragraph 68, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its

1 conduct has caused, or will cause, any injury to Plaintiff.

2 69. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
3 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
4 denies the allegations of Paragraph 69, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
5 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage or injury to Plaintiff.

6 70. Denied.

7 71. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
8 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
9 denies the allegations of Paragraph 71.

10 **FIFTH CLAIM**

11 **Alleged Unfair Competition in Violation of California Common Law**

12 72. Nordica repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs 1-71 as if fully set forth  
13 herein.

14 73. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
15 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
16 denies the allegations of Paragraph 73.

17 74. Denied.

18 75. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
19 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
20 denies the allegations of Paragraph 75.

21 76. Denied.

22 77. The allegations contained in this paragraph state legal arguments or  
23 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Nordica  
24 denies the allegations of Paragraph 77, and Nordica specifically denies that any of its  
25 conduct has caused, or will cause, any damage to Plaintiff.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1                   **NORDICA’S AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES**

2           By asserting these affirmative and other defenses, Nordica does not admit that it  
3 necessarily bears the burden of proof or persuasion for any of the defenses or issues alleged  
4 below. Moreover, at this time, Nordica has insufficient information and knowledge upon  
5 which to form a belief as to whether additional defenses are or may later become available  
6 to it. Nordica reserves the right to amend its response to the Complaint to add, delete or  
7 modify defenses based on additional facts and legal theories which it may or will learn,  
8 including that which may be divulged through clarification of the Complaint, through  
9 discovery, through change, or clarification of governing law, or through further analysis of  
10 Plaintiff’s allegations and claims in this litigation. Subject to the foregoing, and without  
11 prejudice to its denial or other responses to the allegations in Plaintiff’s Complaint, for its  
12 affirmative and other defenses in this action, Nordica hereby asserts and alleges the  
13 following:

14                   **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

15           The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. By way of a  
16 non-limiting example, the Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted  
17 because the use of the terms “Nordica” and/or “Nordica Sauna,” as alleged by Plaintiff, do  
18 not constitute trademark infringement or any other valid claim and are therefore not  
19 actionable. Further, several of Plaintiff’s allegations and claims, including, but not limiting  
20 to, Plaintiff’s cybersquatting claim and allegations of willful misconduct and bad faith are  
21 merely conclusory and unsupported.

22                   **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

23           Plaintiff’s claims against Nordica are barred by one or more of the doctrines of laches,  
24 waiver, equitable estoppel, acquiescence, implied license, unclean hands, unenforceability,  
25 and/or any other equitable remedy. For example, Nordica as it alleges in its Counterclaims,  
26 is a part of the North American Sauna Society and has been a member since February 7,  
27 2023. Ali Kemme, Plaintiff’s Chief Financial Officer and Kim Temme, Plaintiff’s Chief  
28 Executive Officer, are listed as current and/or sitting board members on the North American

1 Sauna Society. See <https://www.saunasociety.org/about>. Upon information and belief, Kim  
2 Temme has been a board member with the North American Sauna Society since at least  
3 November 18th, 2021. Contrary to Plaintiff's assertions in its Complaint (§ 15), Plaintiff  
4 has known or should have known about Nordica since as early as at least February 2023.  
5 Plaintiff's claims are, therefore, barred under the doctrine of laches and other defenses.

6 Plaintiff has also failed to police the market for use of the phrase "NORDIC SAUNA"  
7 and that phrase has been widely used in the sauna industry and others by many to describe  
8 a specific type of sauna and related services. The phrase "NORDIC SAUNA" is generic or  
9 at minimum descriptive. It has also been abandoned and/or forfeited, including due to  
10 Plaintiff's acquiescence with and by ignoring the rampant use of it as a commonly used  
11 phrase in commerce.

12 Further, evidence of Plaintiff's unclean hands is evidenced by its submissions to the  
13 United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"). In fact, among other examples,  
14 Plaintiff committed fraud on the USPTO by submitting a specimen for its trademark  
15 application in October 2022 when, upon information and belief, it knew that it had  
16 abandoned or would be abandoning said mark. Plaintiff is now wrongfully attempting to  
17 enforce a registration for an alleged trademark against Nordica, which was not only  
18 fraudulently obtained, but that Plaintiff has abandoned. Plaintiff has abandoned any rights  
19 to any registered mark by changing the design of the mark and simply using a descriptive  
20 term rather than as a source identifier.

### 21 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22 Nordica has not infringed any applicable trademark under federal or state law.  
23 Nordica has not directly infringed any alleged trademark owned by Plaintiff and any use by  
24 Nordica of the phrase "NORDICA SAUNA" has not and will not cause consumer  
25 confusion, does not infringe upon any registered trademark allegedly owned by Plaintiff,  
26 does not constitute unfair competition under the Lanham Act, and does not constitute false  
27 designation or origin.

28 //

1 **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 Plaintiff's alleged trademark terms are generic, or at least merely descriptive, lack  
3 necessary distinctiveness, and have not acquired the required secondary meaning to legally  
4 function as source identifiers under applicable United States law. Plaintiff's alleged  
5 trademarks should therefore be cancelled and/or denied registration, as they are generic,  
6 merely descriptive, and/or lack necessary distinctiveness to legally function as trademarks  
7 under applicable United States law.

8 **FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

9 Plaintiff's alleged trademarks are not entitled to protection due to the existence of a  
10 crowded field and Plaintiff's failure to police its alleged trademarks. *See, e.g., Miss World*  
11 *(UK) Ltd. v. Mrs. Am. Pageants, Inc.*, 856 F.2d 1445, 1449 (9th Cir. 1988) ("a mark which  
12 is hemmed in on all sides by similar marks on similar goods cannot be very 'distinctive.' It  
13 is merely one of a crowd of marks. In such a crowd, customers will not likely be confused  
14 between any two of the crowd and may have learned to carefully pick out one from the  
15 other"); *see also Halo Mgmt., LLC v. Interland, Inc.*, 308 F. Supp. 2d 1019, 1034 (N.D. Cal.  
16 2003); § 11:85. Crowded trademark markets, 1 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair  
17 Competition (5th ed.) ("In a 'crowded' field of look-alike marks, each member of the crowd  
18 is relatively 'weak' in its ability to prevent use by others in the crowd"). Here, both the  
19 terms "Nordic" and "Sauna," alone or in combination, are so common and necessary to  
20 identify the type of sauna products, and related services at issue in commerce. As such,  
21 Plaintiff cannot possibly claim the exclusive right to use these terms or other trademark  
22 rights in commerce relating to said products and/or services. *See Entrepreneur Media, Inc.*  
23 *v. Smith*, 279 F.3d 1135, 1143–44 (9th Cir. 2002) ("the common and necessary uses of the  
24 word 'entrepreneur' provide strong evidence that EMI cannot have the exclusive right to  
25 use the word 'entrepreneur' in any mark identifying a printed publication addressing  
26 subjects related to entrepreneurship").

27 Any alleged confusion is simply attributable to Plaintiff's selection of a descriptive  
28 and/or generic mark in a crowded field, not due to any act of Nordica.

1 **SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 Without admitting that the Complaint states a valid claim, there has been no damage  
3 in any amount, manner or at all by reason of any act of Nordica alleged in the Complaint  
4 and any of the relief prayed for in the Complaint therefore cannot and should not be granted.

5 **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

6 Plaintiff's claims against Nordica are barred because Plaintiff's alleged damages or  
7 injuries, if any, were not caused by Nordica.

8 **EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

9 Plaintiff's claims for injunctive relief are barred because Plaintiff cannot show that it  
10 will suffer any irreparable harm as a result of any of Nordica's actions.

11 **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

12 The alleged injury or damage suffered by Plaintiff, if any, would be adequately  
13 compensated by damages. Accordingly, Plaintiff has a complete and adequate remedy at  
14 law and is therefore not entitled to equitable relief.

15 **TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

16 Nordica is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Plaintiff's claims  
17 against Nordica are barred, in whole or in part, because of a failure to mitigate damages, if  
18 any damages or injury exists or can be proven at all.

19 **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

20 Plaintiff's claims for relief relating to willful infringement are barred because none  
21 of any alleged acts of infringement or other conduct was or is willful.

22 **TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

23 Plaintiff's claims are barred against Nordica under the fair use doctrine, including,  
24 but not limited to, classic and nominative fair use. Nordica's alleged use of the asserted  
25 trademark is not use of the term for trademark purposes, and Nordica has used any reference  
26 to Plaintiff and/or its products or services, if any, fairly and/or in good faith to refer to its  
27 own goods, services and business. Nordica has taken no action to imply or refer to any  
28 association or affiliation between Plaintiff and Nordica.

1 **THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 Plaintiff abandoned any rights in the purported trademark by failing to prevent  
3 extensive use of same by third parties without license or permission on and in connection  
4 with numerous products and services in the same or related industries.

5 Further, Plaintiff has ceased using its design and word mark claimed in U.S.  
6 Trademark Registration No. 6497517 (“NS Combined Mark”). NS has therefore  
7 demonstrated an intent to abandon the NS Combined Mark since at least by August 2020  
8 when it replaced the NS Combined Mark with a new logo on its website. As such, NS has  
9 abandoned its ability to enforce the NS Combined Mark.

10 **FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

11 Nordica presently has insufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to  
12 whether additional affirmative defenses are available. Accordingly, Nordica hereby  
13 expressly reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses in the event that  
14 discovery indicates or other sources disclose such defenses are relevant or appropriate in  
15 this litigation.

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 No answer is required to the allegations contained in Plaintiff’s prayer for relief. To  
18 the extent a response is required, Nordica denies that it engaged in any alleged misconduct  
19 and denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief that it seeks. Nordica also seeks and  
20 is entitled to dismissal of all of Plaintiff’s claims in this action with prejudice, an award of  
21 attorneys’ fees and costs itself as the prevailing party in this action and such other and  
22 further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

23 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

24 No answer is required to Plaintiff’s demand for jury trial. To the extent a response is  
25 required, Nordica demands a jury trial on all issues so triable pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38.

26 WHEREFORE, having fully answered Plaintiff’s Complaint, Nordica prays that this  
27 Court deny all relief sought by Plaintiff, enter judgment in favor of Nordica against Plaintiff  
28

1 on all claims, award Nordica its costs, attorneys' fees, and expenses and grant Nordica such  
2 other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

3  
4 DATED: August 11, 2025

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

5  
6 By /s/ James E. Doroshow  
7 James E. Doroshow  
8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 Nordica Sauna, LLC  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28